

1412.e.6
2

REMARKS

ON

Dr. KIPLING'S

PREFACE

TO

B E Z A.

PART THE FIRST.

BY THOMAS EDWARDS, LL.D.

C A M B R I D G E:
PRINTED BY B. FLOWER,

M,DCC,XCIII.

БИБЛІОТЕКА

БІБЛІОТЕКА

БІБЛІОТЕКА



44.

11. 20.

94.

БІБЛІОТЕКА МОНТІНІ

CAMBRIDGE

СІМІЛІАТИВ СЕРІЯ

P R E F A C E.

I AM fully sensible that the following remarks will by a certain party be deemed trifling and illiberal:—and that perhaps even by moderate and dispassionate observers they will not be received with a cordial approbation. The latter description of readers I am disposed to treat with every possible respect; and I must therefore beg leave to assure them, —*that* this little production does not in the least degree owe its origin to any *private animosity* towards Dr. Kipling. To the best of my recollection I never met him in company more than three or four times in the course of my life; and upon those occasions nothing passed between us but the customary civilities of society. Had there existed any ground for an hostile disposition, it would have prevented me more forcibly than any motive whatever, from appearing thus openly as the antagonist of our Promoter. I understand, I trust, too well what is due

a

bOTH

both to myself and the public to trouble them with the ebullitions of private resentment or the petty details of private altercations. No possible consideration could ever induce me to disclose to the world the names of those persons, from whom I have received either injuries or insults. Let the authors of them be buried in eternal oblivion.

Neither do I concern myself with Dr. Kipling as a *private individual*; but as exercising, during the absence of the principal, the most ostensible office among us; and as supported by the *power*, though, I would hope, not by the *majority* of the University.—In the first point of view he may be utterly insignificant; but in the second his proceedings may be entitled to our attention.—The *Jame* animadversions which on a private individual would be impertinent and illiberal, on a public character may be fair and necessary.—To the former no one, I am confident, would be more unwilling than myself to utter a syllable, which could occasion the smallest offence; to the latter no one more resolute in declaring his sentiments, when any PUBLIC

LIC

LIC CAUSE may appear to require it.

Neither are these strictures to be attributed to *petulance* or *forwardness*. Nothing more strongly excites my indignation and contempt than an officious interference in the concerns of others. I have observed that it constantly proceeds—either from a childish ignorance of the small importance of each individual,—or from an inability to fill up leisure with a laudable and liberal pursuit,—or from a desire of acquiring an artificial consequence, which neither abilities nor learning, neither birth nor station have bestowed. Studious therefore to avoid the least appearance of such a character, I seldom engage in any business, which is not strictly my own.

But occasions may occur, in which indifference or neutrality might degenerate into a culpable dereliction of principle. The regard, which I have always professed for *literature* and *truth*, would not permit me in an University to sit by as an idle spectator, while an open insult was offered to the one, or a restraint imposed upon the other. I consider our

Promoter's late Preface as disgraceful to a literary society; his conspicuous exertions in the late Trial as injurious to the progress of truth*. By the former, foreigners will be instructed to entertain an unfavorable opinion of our Academical studies;—by the latter, our own members will perhaps be discouraged from communicating the result of their religious enquiries. In repressing therefore by every method his unseasonable activity, our most valuable interests and the substantial purpose of our institution are essentially concerned.

If knowledge is not rendered subservient to the benefit of mankind, the pursuit of it may still indeed be considered as an elegant amusement, but it is destitute of real dignity. Of the different species of knowledge no one is more interesting and important than that which contributes to enforce the belief of a future retribution. The only authentic discovery of a future retribution is contained in the Christian revelation: but in examining this revelation we meet

* See Mr. Paley's *Moral and Political Philosophy*, p. 579.
4to.

with

with serious difficulties, which have perplexed the ingenuity, and disappointed the industry, of the most acute and indefatigable Theologians. Every attempt therefore to elucidate these difficulties, however it may invalidate certain opinions, which bigotry has implicitly admitted, ought surely to be encouraged in an Academical society; where we may presume that the subjects of our investigation will be most minutely discussed by the united efforts of the literati.— Upon this ground I contend, that a restraint imposed in an University upon the Liberty of the Press is *particularly* prejudicial to the interests of truth.

Should I even stand alone, which I trust I shall not, in publicly expressing my disapprobation of Dr. Kipling's efforts both as an author and a promoter*, I shall

* Not only do his efforts as an author and a promoter demand our animadversion, but his conduct likewise as a Syndic of the Press. He was lately instrumental in rejecting the *Fourth Part of Mr. Wakefield's Silva Critica*; a production, which for its learning would have done credit to the most learned age of the University;—a production purely Philological, and unconnected with Theological tenets. But because the religious sentiments of the writer in some former publications did not happen to coincide with the Orthodoxy of the Doctor, he put in his Veto under the pretence of not encouraging *ir*-religious opinions. Thus would these lucubrations have been lost to the world, had they not been rescued from

shall at least be exempt from the discredit, which they may reflect on the University. If we suffer our adversary to proceed in his career without opposition or control, we become answerable for the ravages, which his incursions may occasion: and if individuals will not employ their weapons, how, in the present case, is his progress to be obstructed?

If we are to be tied down to an implicit acquiescence in the creed of our an-

from obscurity by the munificence of Mr. Tyrwhitt.—Inter hos laudatissimos Academicæ dignitatis (says Mr. Wakefield,) atque puræ fidei assertores nomen *profitetur THOMAS KIP-
LING, Sacrae Theologiae Professor; —HÆRETICORUM
MALLEUS;*—But it may not be amiss to observe, that our Promoter, like other persecutors, here takes for granted the very point in question. Why does he call Mr. Wakefield's opinions *irreligious*? Not surely because they are different from his own: Should he answer, because they are not agreeable to the Scriptures; I rejoin, that the Scriptures are capable of different interpretations; by what criterion then are we to determine which is the true one? Should he say, by the established rules of criticism; I ask, where then are his credentials, which may induce us to believe that he himself is in possession of these rules, and better skilled in the application of them than Mr. Wakefield? Should he produce his Preface to Beza, I must beg leave to inform him that this very Preface will decide the cause against him.—Would every one, who is inclined to persecute, interrogate himself in the above manner, before he proceeds to action, he would probably be induced to desist. Every persecutor, who acts consistently, must believe himself to be *infallible*: (see Taylor's Farther Thoughts on the Grand Apostacy, p. 41.) persecution is therefore grounded on a most impious, arrogant, and absurd pretension.—I consider Dr. Kipling's rejection of the *Silva Critica* as a degree of persecution; comprehending under that word not only the infliction of penalties, but the *withholding of advantages*, on account of religious opinions.

ceftors;

cestors, let our chains at least be forged by the hands of an artist, whose abilities and skill are universally acknowledged:—let some productions of his genius exist, to which we may appeal as a ratification of the public voice:—let our leader be a man, to whose judgment we may yield without a moral assurance of being betrayed into error:—let the surrender of our understanding be in some measure sanctioned by the splendor of his name. But who with the spirit of a man or the learning of a scholar can submit to Dr. Kipling as a Theological Dictator?

When good advice has been once offered and rejected, we are not much inclined to bestow a repetition of our favors. I will however take the trouble of reminding the Promoter,—that though our auditory nerves for the space of six long years have been grated by his harsh and dissonant notes in defence of Orthodoxy, yet that his zealous exertions have not hitherto been rewarded with the smallest preferment:—that by his awkward management of the late Trial he has exposed himself to general ridicule:

ridicule:—that if his meritorious efforts should at length be successful, he may enjoy at his leisure the exquisite satisfaction of banishing a man of worth, of talents, and of erudition:—that he has contributed to sow the seeds of dissension and distrust, which the lapse of many years will not be able to extirpate. Let me therefore most earnestly advise him,—not to sport with his reputation or tranquillity in future, without having first stipulated for an adequate reward:—to enter into a rigid estimate of his own abilities, and to determine with impartiality, whether he is qualified to assume the dignity of a public character, and to enchain the attention of his audience by persuasive eloquence or cogent argumentation:—to remember that some men of sense and integrity will be always left among us, who will jealously watch, and resolutely oppose, any similar proceedings:—and that though our discontent at his exercising the office of Deputy Professor has as yet only been expressed by secret murmurs, it may at length break forth into a clamour too loud to be disregarded.

REMARKS

REMARKS &c.

I.

QUI codicem Cantabrigiensem accuratissime per voluntaverat,

How comes our Promoter to be so confident of this? That Dr. Bentley had sufficiently inspected the Cambridge manuscript to form an adequate judgment of its antiquity and value, is highly probable: but that he had given it a *very accurate perusal* at the time, when he wrote his celebrated epistle to Dr. Mill, is more than can easily be proved.—I have been told that an account in manuscript of the earlier part of Dr. Bentley's life is preserved in his family; the only record, which could be at all likely to verify our Promoter's assertion. If he has by any means procured this literary curiosity, he would confer a greater obligation on the world by making it public, (provided he would suffer his servant to correct the press,) than by writing any future *prolegomenas*.—But I

B

humblly

humblly beg his pardon. I had entirely forgotten that he enjoyed a source of information, which is not accessible to vulgar mortals : he has perhaps been favoured by Alma Mater with another VISION *, in which she has revealed to him the private studies of this her illustrious son.

II.

“ Atque hæc quidem talia exemplaria,”
(viz. Alexandrinum, Cantabrigiense, et Oxoniense Actuum Apostolicorum)—

Here it is undeniable that our Promoter represents hæc quidem talia exemplaria as relating only to THREE manuscripts : but let

* When Prince William of Gloucester was admitted to his honorary degree, Dr. Kipling entertained his royal hearers with a learned dissertation on 1 John, 5. 7. but thinking it necessary to regale the Duke's ears with a few well-turned compliments, the fertile fancy of the Promoter was not destitute of an expedient to soften the abrupt transition from the thorns of Theology to the adulation of a court. “ Having finished,” says he, “ these lucubrations, I went to bed: (cubitum ibam:) “ when, lo, who should appear but *Alma mater*: at first I was “ terrified, imagining that she was come to chide me for wasting “ so much of my precious time upon a critical disquisition, “ which ought to have been employed in defending the mo- “ mentous articles of faith: but I was soon relieved from my “ anxiety: Take courage, says she; for to morrow you will “ behold in the senatehouse a most august appearance:” and then our mother revealed to the Promoter the glories of the suc- ceding day.

us attend to Dr. Bentley's own words: Sed nusquam alibi tam frequens earum vocalium inter se permutatio est, quam in 2 codd. MSS. longe antiquissimis, Alexandrino uno in bibliotheca regia, qui integra exhibet biblia et epistolas S. Clementis ad Corinthios: Cantabrigiensi autem altero, mutilo quidem et decurto; quippe qui Acta duntaxat habeat et Evangelistas; verum idem e regione ostentat interpretationem veterem Latinam ad verbum de Græco expressam, dignissimam sane quæ ex oblivione atque tenebris tandem aliquando in lucem edatur. Servantur etiam Oxonii Acta Apostolorum, vetustate quidem pari, sed versione multum diversa; et in Gallia denique Epistolæ S. Pauli, qui codex et antiquitate et Latina versione atque adeo scripturæ et voluminis forma Cantabrigiensi nostro simillimus est et germanissimus. Atque HÆC quidem TALIA EXEMPLARIA, etc.—When Dr. Bentley speaks for himself, it is evident that hæc quidem talia exemplaria relate to FOUR manuscripts; namely, the Alexandrine, the Cambridge, the Oxford, and the Clermont. Dr. Kipling represents Bentley as affirming, that the three former are very far superior to all others in the world both in value and in age: No, would Bentley say, I assert that the Clermont is equal to them in both these respects.—*But*

the words are exactly the same, only there's an OMISSION.

III.

The very next quotation unfortunately furnishes us with an instance of an INSERTION, “*Cæterum*,” ait ille, “*cum sit omnibus indiciis vetustatis insignitus hic codex*, — in Westein himself it is insignis. — *Huic homini*, to use the language of Mr. Toup *, *Bezæ codicem edendum comittas, si quid recte curatum velis?*

IV.

Cur, exempli gratia, Oxoniensi illo, qui Laudi olim fuit, vetustior est habendus, equidem non video.

A Kiplingism. Cicero would probably have chosen *sit*. — I must refer our Promoter, which I shall have occasion to do more than once, to Walker’s Particles, p. 412. or to Turfelinus de Particulis, Cap. 40. p. 25. where he will find instances of the proper regimen of this particle in similar cases. — So, in the foregoing page of the Doctor’s preface, *Qualis fuit Bentleii sententia*, — ipse satis declaravit, ought to have said — ^{* ad Theocrit. Idyll. 27. v. 68.} been

been fuerit.—In the fifth page, Quamvis igitur quo anno, quove etiam saeculo descriptus fuit, —colligere possimus, ought to have been fuerit.—Proximo queramus loco, quæ— scripserunt eruditii, should have been scripserint. We shall not now therefore with the Vice-chancellor suppose only for a moment that the Doctor cannot write Latin, but we shall be firmly persuaded of it, as long as we live: the imputation “will stick to him like Hercules’ “ shirt, and will last him, like that, to his “ funeral *.”

V.

Num vero idem ille, qui tot intexuit adulterina †, clausulam modo dictam sciens volens omisisset?

To this I answer, that either the writer of the Codex Bezae used several Greek manuscripts, from which he selected those readings,

* Bentley's Remarks on Free-thinking, p. 232.

† How are we to reconcile this with what the Doctor says in the sixth page?—cujus autem sententiae haud parvam me judice fidem adjungunt ea, quæ supra memoravimus, codicem Cantabrigiensem, paucis postquam exscriptus est annis, in ecclesia aliqua Christiana vicem supplevisse Evangelistarii, ab Episcopisque porro olim diligenter cautum esse, ne quid adulterinum in ecclesiarum libros irreperebat.

which

which appeared to him to be the best *;—or, that the Codex Bezae is a transcript from a more ancient manuscript †.—Upon the first supposition, the writer would naturally omit the doxology, provided the authority for it did not appear to him so ancient or respectable as that for the other insertions:—this would be a sufficient reason, why he should have rejected the former, and retained the latter.—Upon the second supposition, it is immediately evident that the Doctor's argument can be no proof at all of the age of the Codex Bezae. That the latter supposition may possibly be true, the Doctor himself in his sixth page allows; and by that concession virtually destroys the force of his present reasoning. *De narratiunculis vero, five additamentis, modo memoratis, operaे pretium duco addere, quod magno sunt arguento, si non codicem ipsum Cantabrigiensem, at certe archetypum ejus, prius extitis, quam Divus Hieronymus, a cuius versione absunt, Novi Testamenti textum castigavit.* To the same purpose Bengelius, discussing the doxology, observes ‡: Tale for-

* See Marsh's Notes to Michaelis, V. II. p. 708.—I am well aware that another supposition might be made; (See Mill's Prolegomena, § 1274.) but as the Doctor's own language will not suffer him to have recourse to it, I shall not state it.

† See Marsh, p. 687. ‡ Apparatus Crit. p. 104.

tasse exemplar fuit, ex quo Græca in bilinguem
Cant. transumpta sunt, clausula utrinque carentem.—Upon either supposition therefore our Promoter's argument is inconclusive.

Mr. Marsh, examining the antiquity of the Cambridge manuscript, very justly remarks * :
 “ If we argue from the internal evidence of
 “ the text, and conclude from the antiquity
 “ of its readings, that is, from the circum-
 “ stance that the Codex Bezæ is free from
 “ many spurious additions and alterations,
 “ that were introduced into the more modern
 “ Greek manuscripts, (though it has others
 “ of a different kind not found in modern
 “ manuscripts,) the inference to be deduced
 “ is, *not that the manuscript itself is ancient*, but
 “ only that it has a very ancient text, a mat-
 “ ter, which is of much greater importance
 “ than the antiquity of the vellum and of the
 “ ink.”

—tacent denique cæteri omnes, quo-
rum opera in nostras devenerunt manus, qua-
tuor primorum æræ Christianæ sæculorum
scriptores.

How comes our Promoter to be so confident of this? For Chrysostom was certainly a writer of the fourth century; yet he has both men-

* Page 708.

tioned and commented upon the doxology*; and in the opinion of Montfaucon, between the years 390 & 398. In postremos autem illius presbyteratus annos harumce Homiliarum tempus conjicere possumus, quantum auguror conjectura, videlicet ab anno 390 ad 398†.—But the Doctor acts consistently even in his errors: he is still only copying Beza: for Beza ‡ roundly asserts that the doxology is not explained by Chrysostom:—quæ tamen in vetustissimis aliquibus cod. Græcis defit, et a Cypr. August. et Chrysostomo non explicetur, etiam ubi ex professo totam hanc precationem interpretantur. The Doctor here therefore does not aspire to the distinction of *Chief Blunderer*, which Bentley has bestowed upon Collins §; he is modestly contented with the title of *Deputy Blunderer*: but the University are so unanimously of opinion, those only excepted who are utterly lost to all sense of merit, that he has an indisputable claim to the former appellation, that they will probably thrust him, whether he will or no, into that enviable situation. For this

* Tom. VII. p. 253. 254. Edit. Montfaucon.

† Montfaucon. Præfat. ad Tom. VII. See likewise Hallet's Notes &c. Vol. I. p. 150.

‡ ad Matt. 6. 13.

§ p. 232.

purpose the following grace will in the ensuing term be proposed to the senate;

Cum vir Reverendus THOMAS KIPLING in doctissimis suis *paginibus* rara specimina linguæ antehac inauditæ ediderit, usitatisque artis Logicæ proculcatis regulis, novam ratione inandi methodum in usum tyronum induxit, cumque divinum illud ingenium tales errores procuderit, quales *ullo* alii in mentem ne per somnium quidem unquam venire potuissent, tamque varios, ut de iis differere *omitto*; placeat vobis ut pro tantis meritis *Apollonius* titulo cohonestetur.

But I will turn the Doctor's argument against himself; and prove upon his own principle that he has been guilty of a great *omission* in not ranking with Laud's manuscript another, which is as old as the Cambridge.—Our Promoter affirms that the Codex Stephani ε is not one and the same with the Codex Bezae:—The Codex ε omits the doxology:—The Codex ε contains several remarkable additions to the common text, found only in the text of the Codex Bezae:—sed et inseruntur subinde sat multa, quæ nullus aliis Codex agnoscit:—Num vero idem

ille,

* Wetsten. Prolegom. p. 79. Ed. Semler. See Marsh, p. 688.

—I see not by what means the Doctor can escape the force of this argument unless by supposing with Semler that the Codex ε is a transcript from the Codex Bezae. But even this sup-

ille, qui tot intexuit adulterina, clausulam modo dictam sciens volens omisisset?—Therefore the Codex ϵ is as old as the Cambridge manuscript.

But the Doctor has been guilty of another great omission, in not *proving*, what his argument evidently supposes, that the doxology is *spurious*. I do not mean to give any opinion upon the subject myself: I shall only quote two writers, who may perhaps induce our Promoter to suspect that the matter is not so certain as he had imagined. Professor White, whom he calls *doctissimus scriptor limatissimusque*, speaking of the doxology, observes:—
Si modo additio sit ulla: quod fortasse pepercera dixisse, Vir in primis doctus, si meminisset hanc Doxologiam e Kaddish Judaica sumptam, inde in precibus Apostolicis ex præscripto Domini fuisse usurpatam, indidemque ad Liturgias Græcas profluxisse. (Præfat. ad Verf. Syr. Philoxen. p. 7.)—“ If you allow that the dox-

position will not answer his end: for he has given us an account of certain transcripts from Beza's MS. for this express purpose, ne futuri forte critici ad parentem simul prolemque quasi ad tot testes provocent omnino diversos. Now the Doctor must know that former critics have cited the Codex ϵ and the Codex Bezæ as two distinct witnesses: if therefore he embraces Semler's hypothesis, he has still been guilty of a great *omission* in not stating and supporting it, that future critics may not fall into the error of some of their predecessors.

“ ology

"ology is spurious," says Mr. Porson, "you
"reject a reading, that — is found in all the
"Greek MSS. except eight; in two of the old-
"est Latin copies; in some MSS. of the Arabic
"and Persic; in the Syriac, the Armenian, the
"Gothic, and the Aethiopic." (Letters to Mr.
Travis, p. 158.)

But I have not yet completed my enumeration of *omissions*. The Doctor tells us in his sixth page: *Et crediderim sane Græca libri nostri, si modo ad unam ullam mutata fuerint versionem, ad libros potius Syriacos fuisse mutata.* The Doctor therefore here admits that the Syriac version is older than Beza's manuscript. But the Syriac version *contains the doxology*. What then can our Promoter say? that the version is here interpolated? This must not only be said, but shewn to be *probable*, if he wishes to maintain his argument. But whatever he may now urge in his defence, he has been guilty of a great *omission* in not advancing it before.—I must not forget to mention, that Travis affirms that the Syriac version is subsequent to the age of Chrysostom, because it contains the doxology. So I shall leave these two stanch polemics, as Boyle did Bentley and Wotton, *to the pleasure of their mutual civilities.*

What does the Doctor mean by *libros Syriacos*? Was the Cambridge manuscript then al-

tered from the *Philoxenian* version, which was not made before the year 508?

VI.

Id quod ideo afferui, quia sectiones, quæ vocantur Ammonianæ, solæ per se in hoc nostro incedunt, in illo autem cum Eusebii canonibus sociatæ.

Our Promoter seems to be secure that hence it naturally follows, that the Codex Bezae is older than the Codex Alexandrinus; but he is too hasty in his conclusion. Dr. Mill in his *Prolegomena** gives us the following information: Codices quidem vidimus, quibus ad marginem adpicti erant numeri isti seorsim, et absque Canonis Eusebiani comitatu; pervetustum Bezae Cantabrigiensem, ad cuius oram extant, manu diversa; et alterum quendam quadrin-
gentorum circiter annorum.—“I have seen two
“manuscripts,” says Mr. Marsh†, “in the
“University Library at Cambridge,—a MS.
“in Trinity College Library,—and the Cod.
“Gonyilli et Caii, all written in the common
“small Greek character, and at least six hun-
“dred years after the time of Eusebius, in
“which the Ammonian sections are written

" in the margin, without any reference to the
" canons of Eusebius. Their absence there-
" fore from the Codex Bezae affords no abso-
" lute proof of its antiquity."

VII.

Non est incredibile igitur vixisse illum, qui
Ammonianas sectiones in codice nostro nota-
verit, vel saeculo exeunte tertio, vel ineunte
quarto.

As this third argument is to be considered as deduced from the second, which has been just now shewn to be destitute of validity, it of course falls to the ground.—Thus do the Doctor's three arguments for the antiquity of his manuscript turn out to be as *visionary* as his interview with Alma Mater.

In the following quotation from Mill there is a *false print*, ipsum for ipsam.

VIII.

— aut prorsus ignoravit Bakerus Alpha-
betum Gothicum, aut Bezae exemplar nun-
quam inspicerat.

The

The second part of the alternative can be only considered as serving to fill up the sentence; like the—*qui codicem Cantabrigiensem accuratissime pervolutaverat*,—applied to Bentley: for if there is any meaning in Mr. Baker's language, he had certainly inspected the manuscript with some degree of attention; as will sufficiently appear from the following passages:

“ I will not trace him thro' his mistakes; I will
 “ only note one other, which an *Englishman*
 “ has better opportunities of examining than
 “ other men have.”—“ Any one that has ob-
 “ served that manuscript, knows, that the Latin
 “ copy answers the Greek so exactly, that there
 “ are very few various readings.”—“ There is
 “ one pretty probable way of trying it, (the
 “ Latin version,) by comparing the citations
 “ in the New Testament with the same texts,
 “ as they stand in the ancient Vulgar in the
 “ Old, *This I have done* in the Psalms, and am
 “ far from meeting with any exact agreement.”
 —“ all which mistakes are to be met with in two
 “ chapters, and more which *I forbear to mention*,
 “ as I do to translate those I have mentioned,
 “ because I would not uncover the nakedness
 “ of this version.”—“ with other Gothisms,
 “ that might be observed, did I design this for
 “ any more than a hint or specimen*.”

* P. 235. 236. 237. 238. 240.

IX.

Nonne potius ex tanta sequitur cum tot testibus probatissimis congruentia, codicis Bezae Graeca ad Evangelistarum autographa quam proxime accedere?

Dr. Kipling to confirm his opinion that the Greek of Beza's manuscript approaches very nearly to the autographs of the Evangelists, among other witnesses cites Dr. Mill.—But before I produce the passage, I must notice a beauty, which frequently occurs in our Promoter's Latinity: *Quanti Bentleius fecit codicis nostri textum, supra jam ostendimus, forfecerit.*—The words quoted from Dr. Mill by the Promoter are these: *Verum utcunque mire interpolata sint Bezae codicis Graeca, cum tamen in multis retineant puritatem primævorum, unde deducta sint, fontium, copiam certe haud exiguam exhibent genuinarum lectionum, a receptis hodiernis discrepantium.* It is evident that this passage, as it here stands *alone*, is far from being favorable to our Promoter's purpose: for how a text can be *exceedingly interpolated*, and yet approach *very near* to the autographs of the Evangelists, I must leave his sagacity to discover. But when we examine the context, we find that Dr. Mill's testimony

makes

makes directly *against* him. *Hujus certe*, says Dr. Mill†, *de quo jam agimus*, *Græca quod attinet*, *vix dici potest*, *quam supra omnem modum in iis digerendis licenter se gesserit*, *ac plane lascivierit Interpolator*, *quisquis ille*. *In animo ipsi fuisse prima fronte credideris*, *NON quidem textum ipsum exhibere*, *quem ediderant ipsi Evangelistæ*, *sed observato duntaxat S. Textus ordine et historia*, *singula Evangelia absolutiora ac pleniora reddere*.—*Imo vero certum illud unum*, *Digestorem hujus textus in hisce libris Evangeliorum et Actuum grassatum fuisse pro arbitrio*; *addidisse*, *sustulisse*, *mutasse*, *plane uti ferebat animus*; *multoque*, *ut verbo dicam*, *labore illud egisse*, *ut textus ipsorum Evangelistarum*, *magna sui parte*, *in aliud quendam transformatus incederet*. Thus we see, that the witness cited by our Promoter to prove, that the Greek of Beza's manuscript approaches very nearly to the autographs of the Evangelists, turning out refractory deposes the contrary; namely, that it appears to have been the intention of the author of this text *NOT to exhibit the text, which the Evangelists themselves published*;—and, that the text of the Evangelists themselves, in a great part of it, *is transformed into a different one*.

Neque aliter quidem sentiebant J. J. Wetsteinus,—

The Doctor here informs us that Wetstein was of the same opinion with Mill: which information is indeed true enough; but contains perhaps a truth not very agreeable to our Promoter: for Wetstein to the first part of my quotation from Mill subjoins the following remark: *quibus Millii prol. 1274. verbis, QUÆ NOSTRA FECIMUS, addimus et omissiones quamplurimas et mutationes occurrere, præcipue ubi authenticam lectionem repugnare existimabat vel historiæ veritati, vel gloriæ Christi, vel aliis scripturæ locis, exigui admodum judicii Consarcinator.*—He again speaks of the manuscript in terms equally unfavorable: *Quod si porro Criticorum audacia, qui indoctum Græcum Latini hominis nobis pro sincero Evangeliorum textu venditant, excusari vix potest, longe minus excusandus videtur alter ille error, quo nobis unicum testem, adeoque unicam codicis NON optimæ note auctoritatem, pro duobus testibus gravissimis, auctoritateque omni exceptione majori produxerunt,—** And yet forsooth Wetstein is brought as a witness to prove, that

* Prolegom. p. 87. 91. Ed. Semler.—See Whiston's Sacred History, Vol. V. p. 307. 308. where Mr. Whiston himself asserts that Dr. Mill's accounts of this copy are *prodigiously partial, weak, and injudicious;*—and that Dr. Mill's very hard censures of this manuscript are *too rashly agreed to by* Wetstein. And yet Whiston is said by our Promoter to have entertained the same opinion of the manuscript as Wetstein and Mill.

the Greek of Beza's manuscript approaches very nearly to the autographs of the Evangelists.

— abs re non erit addere, quid de cunctis ejus generis censuit exemplaribus —

The Doctor's old error, for *censuerit*.—In the second quotation from Griesbach there is a *false print*, *consentione* for *consensione*.

— *consilio* &c. *consensu* &c. *consentione* &c. *consensione* &c.

— *consenserunt* *monachos* **X.** *consensum* *iu* *sic* *consensu* *monachos* *iu* *sic* *consensu* *monachos* *iu* *sic*

— *primum*, *quod multo crebrius occurrit* *et in versione ista veneranda et in exemplari* *Bezae MSto* *vocula* *...*, *quam in ullo* *allo*, *quod legerim*, *volumine*; *secundo*, *quod eadem* *haec conjunctio* *in binis illis voluminibus singu-* *lari quodam*, *simul et in utrisque consimili*, *modo sæpenumero adhibetur*.

The three instances produced by the Doctor from his manuscript in confirmation of the former position are nothing to the main purpose: For—The first instance is translated in the Codex Vercellensis, *Ad illi responderunt universi*, *et dixerunt*:—in the Codex Veronensis, *Ad illi responderunt omnes*, *et dixerunt*. The second instance is translated in Cod. Vercell. and Veron. *et manducemus*, *et æpulemur*. The third instance is translated in Cod. Vercell. Veron. and Brixian. *et abiit*, *et abscondit se*. And

Blanchinus

Blanchinus (ad Matt. 2. 8.) remarks in general : Ita *passim* Latine solet reddere Antiquus Interpres, cum Græcus textus orationem nectit aoristis,—For any thing therefore which the frequent use of the particle *καὶ* in Beza's MS. proves to the contrary, the Greek of it *may* have been corrupted from the Latin*.

With respect to our Promoter's latter position concerning the *peculiar* use of the particle *καὶ*, I will ask him what he says to the following passage of St. Matthew, 28. 9. *καὶ εἰπεινότοι αὐτούς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ΚΑΙ ἐδί ο Ιησος απῆγεται αὐταῖς, λέγων, καυπετι.* Here *καὶ* is redundant in the *very same manner*, (for *εἰπεινότοι*—constitutes a dependent clause as much as a participle,) as in the Doctor's examples. (See Grotius and Wakefield ad loc.) Conf. Luc. 2. 21. Act. 10. 17. Hoo-gev. Doctrin. Partic. p. 535. 553.—Should the Doctor call in question the authenticity of the readings in these places of the New Testament, that will not at all affect the purpose, for which they are brought: whether genuine or not, they are the readings of the *common copies*; and therefore prove that this use of the particle *καὶ* is not *peculiar* to the Septuagint and Beza's MS.

* See an instance not very dissimilar in Semler. Appendic. ad Wetstein. Prolegom. p. 596.

The Doctor's instance from Exodus is not in point; for the *καὶ* could not there be omitted without spoiling the sense. The whole verse stands thus: καὶ γνωστοῖς ταῖς δι' Αἰγυπτίων, οὐτέ τινα εἴμι Κύρος, εἰπεῖν τὴν χεὶρα με εἰπεῖν Αἰγυπτίου, ΚΑΙ ἐξῆν τὸν νῦν Ισραὴλ εἰ μήτε αὐτῶν. *And the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord, WHEN I stretch forth mine hand upon Egypt, AND bring out the children of Israel from among them.* The *εἰπεῖν* evidently depends upon *οὐτέ τινα Κύρος*, whereas our Promoter, by playing his favorite game of *omission*, would make us believe that it depends upon *καὶ ἐξῆν*.

But should we allow that the frequent and peculiar use of this mighty particle indisputably proves that the Greek of our manuscript has not been corrupted from the Latin, and that it is to be held in estimation,—*as far as this word is concerned*; by what Logic are we hence to infer its *general* purity and excellence? Some of the Doctor's witnesses have shewn themselves so backward and diffident in espousing the side on which they were brought, that I concluded, when he came to speak for himself, he would amply supply their deficiency, and edify his readers by solid argumentation. But when we find that we are put off with a trifling remark on the particle *καὶ*, and that this is the only illustration which he affords us of the value of his manuscript,—

I must venture to think that he had better have here adopted his late maxim of having nothing to say upon any thing, but submitting the whole to the judgment of the court.

We must observe that in this half page of fac-simile there are no less than three errors:—
~~εγιν λεγομενος~~ for εγιν, — ~~ιναγγελιον~~ for εναγγελιον, — ~~της νιος~~ for νιος. Now the Doctor cannot reasonably object to be tried by the rule, which he has himself adopted to discover the number of Wetstein's blunders in noting the various readings of the Codex Bezae. Let us see then:—Three blunders in half a page will give six in a page: In the whole fac-simile there are 828 pages; which will give 4968 errors.—This sum may perhaps appear very extravagant: but we must remember that the Doctor is fond of having enough and to spare: for in the opinion of the Vicechancellor he brought much superfluous evidence to prove that Mr. Frend was the author of the pamphlet: so in the present case, if according to the Doctor's calculation Beza's manuscript contains 4311 verses, 4968 errors will give one to each verse, and 657 to spare.—But the Promoter, suffocated and overwhelmed, will perhaps as a last refuge cry out, that he has inserted a saving clause in favor of Wetstein: *Nisi vero in quandam Wetstenianæ editionis partem forsitan inciderim cæteris mendoſorem,*—True, Sir.
 This

This exception may certainly be applied in favor of Wetstein: there was no particular reason why Wetstein should have been more attentive in these two chapters than in any other; he may perhaps have been less so: but there *were* two very strong reasons why You, Sir, should have been *particularly* attentive in your Preface: (1) because You must have been sensible that it is the only part of the work, which would be read by the majority of your readers; who will therefore from this part of it receive a favorable or unfavorable impression of the execution of the whole: and (2) because even to Critics, who mean to consult the fac-simile, and have not an opportunity of comparing it with the original, your accuracy or inaccuracy in the Preface must be a pledge of your accuracy or inaccuracy in the body of the work. Charity itself therefore, which will not allow us to suppose you devoid of the respect due to your readers, suffers us not to apply to yourself your exception in favor of Wetstein.

XI.

Ad Latina quod attinet, tria sunt quærenda.
Quorum primum est, Anne extiterint ante
Hieronymi tempora?—

and T.

Our

Our Promoter here professes to *enquire*, whether the Latin of Beza's manuscript existed before the time of Jerom. And what is the whole of the enquiry? Versionem latinam nostram ante Hieronymi extitisse emendationem, nemo unquam, quod sciam, præter Bakerum negavit. What then?—Why then—(this new Logic is desperately unpalatable, but we must gulp and swallow,) it *did* exist before Jerom's correction. And so ends the enquiry.—But cautious readers may perhaps be disposed to ask,—Is Dr. Kipling's reading so very extensive, that he is acquainted with every author, who has mentioned this version? Because *to the best of his knowledge* no one except Baker has denied his position, does it therefore follow that no one else *has* denied it? Or should it be allowed that no one else *has* denied it, is it a necessary consequence that the position is true? We think that as the Doctor professed to *enquire* into the subject, he should have supported his opinion by probable arguments.

But what will our Promoter say to the following passage of Pfaffius*? Vulgata autem yetusque illa versio, quæ in Codice hoc Bezæ exstat, itidem satis corrupta atque interpolata est, NEC ascendit ad auctoritatem veteris illi-

* *Dissert. Crit. &c.* p. 76.

us, quæ ante Hieronymi tempora, imo seculis
ante-Nicaenis existit. Vehementer enim dis-
crepat ab iis dictorum S. Codicis allegationibus,
quæ apud Tertullianum, Cyprianum, aliosque
veteres reperiuntur. This very reason is as-
signed by Mr. Baker:—“The same observa-
tion will hold in the old Ecclesiastic writers,
as far as the Vulgar can be traced there.”

But I will prove upon the Doctor’s own prin-
ciple that his enquiry is by no means satis-
factory, and that it ought to have been effectu-
ally pursued. The Doctor maintains that the
Latin version is derived from *no other* source
than from the Greek text of his own manu-
script. Now should it appear disputable, (as
it certainly is,) whether the Greek is as old as
the time of Jerom, it will of course appear
disputable whether the Latin is so:—the Latin
upon this hypothesis cannot be older than the
Greek. If therefore our Promoter had wished
to support his position, he ought to have prov-
ed from *internal evidence* that the version is
older than Jerom.

We must now proceed to examine the Doc-
tor’s representation of Mr. Baker’s argument;
which may justly be considered as one of his
master-pieces.—quem in errorem eum indux-
isse videtur hujusmodi quoddam argumentum.

“ Græca

" Græca Bezæ codicis Evangelistarum auto-
 " graphis ad omnia respondent.
 " Latina versio Bezæ codicis græco ejusdem
 " textui ad omnia respondet.
 " Si itaque hæc versio Divo Hieronymo ante-
 " cessisset, Hieronymi castigationibus non opus
 " fuisset."

The first proposition would discover such gross ignorance in any person who could utter it, that we cannot conceive it likely to have proceeded from Mr. Baker, or from any one else, who had the least pretensions to literature. Who knows not, to use the language of Bentley†, " That the real text of the sacred writer does not now (since the originals have been so long lost) lie in any *single* MS. or edition, but is dispersed in them all." — Mr. Baker's argument, when properly stated, stands thus:

The Latin of Beza's manuscript answers the Greek so exactly, that there are very few various readings.

If then the Latin be ancient, as the Vulgar undoubtedly was almost as ancient as the preaching of the Gospel at Rome, the Greek probably is so too.

Had there been a Latin copy so exactly agreeing with the Greek original, before Jerom's

† Remarks on Free-thinking, p. 96.

time, it is not probable that he would have thought a new translation necessary.

Now we here find not a single syllable concerning the *autographs* of the Evangelists.—We see that the Doctor in his second proposition has made Mr. Baker assert, that the Latin version of Beza's manuscript agrees *entirely* with its Greek text, instead of “*so exactly, that there are very few various readings.*”—And then our Promoter triumphantly cries out, *Cito vero comperiet eruditus lector falsam esse tum primam, tum proximam, argumenti partem.*

So far was Mr. Baker from believing that this manuscript answers entirely to the autographs of the Evangelists, that he brought its age as low, and weakened its authority as much as possible, that it might be able to do the less hurt; and never desired to see it published.

If now Dr. Kipling could not give us a just representation of such a plain argument, where are his abilities? if he would not, where is his ingenuity? But I have yet a secret to whisper in the Doctor's ear;—which is, that if he had properly stated the argument and attended to the subsequent language of Mr. Baker, he would have discovered that the argument is *nothing*

to the purpose, for which he produces it. For Mr. Baker by this argument did not mean to prove generally that the Latin of the Cambridge manuscript did not exist before Jerom, but that it did not exist *as the ancient Vulgar*: which will be sufficiently evident from his own words: “ If it be said the Greek in that manuscript may be a more modern copy, but still before St. Jerome’s time, and that the Latin is translated from it; this may be true: but then the Latin is no longer the ancient Vulgar, but a later version.”

Our Promoter then in his *first* proposition has made Mr. Baker say what he did *not* say: —in his *second* he has misrepresented what Mr. Baker *did* say: —and the argument itself, when the context is considered, is found to be *nothing to the purpose*, for which it was brought.

— Alterum, E quonam defluxerint græco fonte?

This is certainly a point, which ought to be accurately discussed by an editor of Beza: yet the Doctor’s *enquiry* into this subject is not much more satisfactory than what he had advanced on the former question.—He brings five instances to prove that the Latin of his manuscript was derived from no other source than from the Greek of the same; and tells us that he could add six hundred more. This

may be very true; and Dr. Mill speaks to the same purpose*: *Latina vero—cum in plerisque accurate ad textum Græcum accomodata rit Digestor Operis, retento eodem verborum quantumcunque transpositorum ordine, et quidem vitiis ipsis sui Codicis;*—But how are we to account for the *differences* between the Latin and the Greek? Let us hear our Promoter: *Atqui discrepantiæ illæ originem, credo, debuerunt omnes, vel interpretis ipsius incurriæ, vel describentium oscitantiaæ, vel denique nimio apud primævos Christianos corrigendi studio.* Let us now hear Dr. Mill:—*tum certe ex variis hic illic a Græco abeuntibus liquet, Versionem hanc diversi ab hoc nostro textus fuisse,*—Which now of the two are we to credit? Dr. Mill takes at least the most pains to gain converts to his hypothesis; for he produces *examples* in support of it; which our Promoter would have done well to notice: but the latter expected, I presume, that we should repose an implicit confidence in his *belief.* And so ends the enquiry.

Non quod Latina nostra Græcis e regione scriptis ad omnia omnino respondent.

A Kiplingism, for *respondeant.* And to shew how entirely at hap-hazard the Doctor writes Latin, in another place he stumbles upon the

right mood : *Non quod criticorum horum fidei — detrahere studeam.*

Quanto carius vel auro *existimavit* Bentleius unumquodque quidem Veteris Italicæ monumentum, hæc ipsius verba ex abundanti declarant.

Ha! ha! ha! Do they indeed? it is rather improbable that they should:—and *ex abundanti* too: nothing will satisfy the Doctor but enough and to spare.—We must however not neglect in our way his favorite beauty of style, *existimavit* for *existimaverit*.—The words of Bentley are these: *Jam autem illud unice expeto, ut si quos Latinos veteris notæ Actuum, Epistolarum, et Apocalypseos codices apud vos repereris, eos accuratissime tam ad verba quam ad verborum ordinem cum Papæ editione conferas: hujusmodi Latinos veterimos vel Græcis ipsis prætulerim.* Our Promoter's eyes may perhaps be better than mine; but I protest I cannot discover in these words a single syllable concerning the Old Italic: and, as I hinted above, it is not likely that I should. For we well know that Bentley denied this version to have had any existence whatever. Let us hear what Sabatier says upon the subject †:—*Ego vero jam antea noram hujus commenti inventorem esse Bentleyum.* Datis namque vir doc-

† *Præfat. ad Tom. III. Bibl. Sacr. &c. p. 17.*

tus litteris ad unum e nostris, scripsferat pri-
mum se, ex Millii et aliorum praconio, versionem
illam Italicam aliquando investigasse, sed id solum
ex diuturna investigatione consecutum esse, ut de
invenienda illa desperaret. Deinde alias nobis
ipsis inscriptas dedit litteras, quibus non jam
tantum de invenienda hac versione penitus des-
perare se significat, verum etiam hanc NUL-
LAM FUISSE OMNINO, NEC RE NEC
NOMINE, his verbis pronunciat: *In diuturno*
jam errore de commentitia illa Italica versati sunt
viri eruditi, quæ tantum abest ut veterum Patrum
totiusque Latinae Ecclesie publicum authenticum
que exemplar unquam fuerit, ut nulla fuerit om-
nino, nec re nec nomine. To the same purpose
speaks Dr. Middleton*: “ But after all this
noise about the old Vulgate, or, as many have
called it, the *Italic Version*, the world, it
seems, is yet entirely in the dark about it;
for when our Master’s edition comes out, it
will shew that there *never was any such Ver-*
sion in being, as the learned, and Dr. Mill
especially, have so long been blundering
about; and that the notion was falsely
grounded upon an abused and mistaken pas-
sage of St. Austin; which our editor will set
in a true and new light.” And yet our Pro-
moter informs us, that “ Bentley’s own words

* *Miscellan. Works, V. II. p. 379.*

“ abun-

" abundantly shew, how much he esteemed
" every monument of the *Old Italic version*,"
which version he, the said Bentley, did not be-
lieve to have had any existence whatever.

In the twelfth page ~~ancient~~ is a *false print* for
~~ANCIENTS~~

With regard to the *place* where the Codex
Bezae was written,—as the hypothesis, which
is adopted by Dr. Kipling, has been maintained
by Georgi, and, if it be erroneous, as I am
chiefly concerned with the errors, which are
peculiar to our Promoter,—as the ground like-
wise is too slippery to build any solid conje-
ture; I shall not enter into a discussion of the
subject. I must however remark that, unless
it is necessary to suppose that every Greek and
Latin scribe was perfectly skilled in the ortho-
graphy § and grammar of his native language,
the Doctor has been too hasty in his conces-
sion that the manuscript was not written by a
Greek, and too positive in his denial that it
was written by a Latin:—and that he has been

§ How far this was from being the case with respect to many
of the Greek scribes, we may learn from the following passage
of Griesbach, where he is speaking of the Codex L: (Symbol.
Crit. p. civ.) *Neque tamen est, cur dubitemus græcum eum*
suisse hominem. Saltim vitiorum contra orthographiam ad-
missorum frequentia contrarium neutiquam probat. Tali
enim vel in ipsis græcorum lectionariis, a scribis græcis in græ-
corum usum exaratis, crebro deprehendimus.

~~over~~

guilty

guilty of an *omission* in not attempting to explain why a Latin translation was added to a Greek manuscript written in Egypt. Allowing Georgi to have shewn that *some* persons in that country might understand Latin, yet still the addition of a Latin version as a mean of rendering the original more intelligible, appears not natural and probable||. Should the hypothesis that the Codex Bezae was written in Egypt seem to be countenanced by its orthography or pseudography and many of its readings, we may suppose with Semler that the *original*, from which its Greek text was copied, was written in Egypt; or with Mr. Marsh that the writer of it *used* a manuscript of the Alexandrine edition*.

XII.

Quam prave Ægyptii græce locuti sint, ex hisce Luciani verbis colligi potest, οὐγενταζεις φυτη, quæ in Φλωτεύδη ejus occuruntur.

May it not be said with equal justice, Quam

|| Nec in Ægypto Latinam versionem consuluisse videntur, cum magis Codices Græco-Ægyptiacos, quam Græco-Latinos scriberent. Woide Præfat. § 69.

* See Marsh, p. 683. 708.

prave

prave Thomas Kipling Græce locutus sit; ex
ejus colligi potest? What dialect is this?
The Doctor, I suppose, declined the word,
with a superfluous accent on the first syllable;
such as is given to *anōn* on *yd* in *anōn*—
XIII.
Quam conjecturam ex eo fecit Wetstenius,
quod Thomæ codicis in margine plurimæ
valde longæ reperiuntur lectiones, quas frus-
tra alibi quam in Cantabrigiensi codice quæ-
ras.
We here article and object to our Promoter,
that he has not given a complete representa-
tion of this conjecture; for he has omitted after
“longæ” the words “addo etiam valde ab-
“surda.” AND WE ARTICLE AND OB-
JECT AS ABOVE. For if a coincidence in
many very long readings is considered as a
proof that one manuscript was collated with
another, a coincidence in *absurd* readings must
strengthen that proof.—Wetstein in another
place uses the same argument to shew that all
the copies of the old Latin version flowed from
one source.—plerumque tamen tantus est con-
sensus in *absurdis* etiam lectionibus, ut satis ap-

F pareat. **P**areat. **P**areat. **P**areat. **P**areat. **P**areat.

pareat omnia ex uno fonte manasse, ex eademque editione descriptos omnes produisse †. certissimum est Charkel versionem Philoxenianam cum nostri codicis Græcis non contulisse, — id est no transcripsionem s dicitur.

This argument is by no means so very decisive as the Doctor imagines: for it is *possible*, as Mr. Marsh observes ||, "that Thomas might be here guilty of an oversight; as Wetstein says of Stephens, where the Codex Bezæ differs from the Codex Stephani c." The possibility of the oversight will appear evident from the following charge of Wetstein against Beza: *Cur ipse minimam partem variationum, quas in suis codicibus Cantabrigiensi et Claramontano viderat, promulgavit, longe plura vero et præcipual non suppressit tantum, verum etiam omnino regavit interdum ad notitiam suam pervenisse?* Professor Adler indeed speaks of the conclusion as certain, — that Thomas had not seen the Cambridge manuscript: but it is manifest that his words must be understood with some grains of allowance; as in another place of his treatise he considers it as possible that Thomas might have seen this manuscript. *Nisi forte in singulare legendum sit: — in (uno) exemplo græco, et idem codex Cantabrigiensis his verbis innuatur.* ¶

³⁵⁹ † Prolegom. p. 222. Ed. Semler. || P. 703.

§ Ubi supr. p. 380. ‡ Vers. Syr. p. 91. 133.

XIV.

Let us now see what the Doctor makes of Wetstein's second conjecture. Cum vero talis est in nostro etiam codice Evangeliorum ordo, conjectit inde Wetstenius exemplar Bezæ ex Ægypto migrasse in Galliam.—Wetstein, I am confident, could never have advanced such a senseless argument. For what foundation is there for conjecturing that Druthmar saw the Cambridge manuscript, because it preserves the same order of the Gospels as a copy which he inspected; which order, for ought that appears from the Doctor's representation of the conjecture, may be common to other manuscripts? But when we look into Wetstein himself, we discover our Promoter at his old trade of *omission and insertion*; for Wetstein's words are,—
 vidi tamen, nisi admodum fallor, hunc ipsum codicem Cantabrigensem, qui *UNUS et SOLUS* omnium codicum Græce scriptorum hunc ordinem servat. **AND WE ARTICLE AND OBJECT AS ABOVE.**

We shall immediately perceive that one of the objections exhibited by the Doctor against the argument with this omission is nugatory and foreign to the purpose:—alii denique, quod Evangeliorum ordo, supra memoratus, Bezæ

exemplaris non proprius est, sed plurium, qua græce, qua latine scriptorum, communis*. For the argument, *as stated by the Doctor*, does not deny it.—But he proceeds: Atqui, ex hisce argumentis illud nequaquam effici, alium esse Bezae codicem atque librum a Druthmaro inspectum, nemo non videt:—Though the above objection does not necessarily prove that Beza's manuscript is not one and the same with Druthmar's, yet it entirely destroys the *foundation* of Wetstein's conjecture, when properly represented. It is now therefore no longer Wetstein's conjecture, but our Promoter must take it upon himself. Let us examine how it thrives under his hands.

Primo utique notandum est, quod, avulsis olim a codice Cantabrigiensi Latinis eis, quæ scriperat prima manus a Matth. 2.20. ad. 3.8. ejusdem Evangelii, lacunam hanc supplevit scriba seu decimi, seu forte noni saeculi.

Secundo, reperiet lector hoc supplementum cum textu latini codicis *omnino* convenire, qui, ante decimum descriptus saeculum, complures annos asservatus est in Corbeiæ antiquæ cœnobio.

Postremo denique, pro comperto habemus
 * In a reference at the bottom of the page there is a false print; Græco-Copto-Theb. for Theb.
 secessisse

secessisse Druthmarum medio circiter noni saeculi in idem Corbeiense monasterium.

— Quid est igitur, quare probabilis non habeatur hæc Wetstenii conjectura, Exemplar Cantabrigiense Druthmari in manus quondam incidisse? non nobis omnino nescimus sed hi ut iudeo

Now this supplement agrees *so* exactly with the Corbeian version, that in the course of these ten verses there are *three* variations. For in 2. 23. for *prophetas* in vers. Cant. we have *prophetam* in vers. Corb.—3. 1. *autem* is inserted in vers. Cant. which is wanting in vers. Corb. and this insertion is particularly remarkable, because the *&* is wanting in Cod. Cant. The Corbeian version therefore would have given a literal rendering of the Cambridge Greek text, which the present version does not.—3. 5. for *exiebat* in vers. Cant. we have *exibat* in vers. Corb.—But this supplement agrees exactly with the Vulgate, except that in 3. 5. for *exiebat* we have *exibat*.—3. 6. for *in Jordane ab eo*—*ab eo in Jordane*. Why then is it not equally, and indeed more probable, that this supplement was taken from the Vulgate? as Sabatier affirms it to have been. Quæ omnia loca ex *Vulgata versione* restituta sunt.—Have I not now a right in my turn to ask, Quid est igitur, quare probabilis habeatur hæc *sluga* *canitib* *metu* *monosol* *in Kiplingii* *mit*?

Kiplingii conjectura, Exemplar Cantabrigiense
Druthmari in manus quondam incidisse? ni illo
Adde, quod vel decimo, sæculo vero undecimo,—

I must refer our Promoter to Walker's Par-
ticles, p. 285. 286. from which he may learn
that *ve* in the Latin language does not answer
to *vel*.

XV.

The Doctor treats Wetstein's *third* conje-
ture with no more respect than he did the *se-
cond*, and a similar objection may be made to
the representation which he has given of it.
Quum autem in Cantabrigiensi codice ita pro-
fus nunc legimus, tertiam hanc inde fecit Wet-
steinus conjecturam, Codicem MStum nostrum
eum ipsum esse, quem veluti testem Episcopus
Claremontanus Tridenti protulerat. Wet-
stein's own words are, Hæc enim lectio ~~hæc~~
~~nus~~ in SOLO Cantabrigiensi reperta est. AND
WE ARTICLE AND OBJECT AS ABOVE.
—To Wetstein's conjecture thus properly stat-
ted how impertinent and nonsensical is our
Promoter's objection! Interim concedatur ne-
cessum est, Wetsteinii argumentum ad conclusi-
onem suam stabilendam parum valere; vni-
prius probari possit, aut exemplar illud Claro-
montanum lectionem, quam diximus, singula-
rem

rem unice tunc exhibuisse, aut ex Evangeliorum exemplaribus, quotquot ad concilium adfuerint Tridentinum, ne unum quidem vel post periisse, vel hodie delitescere nobis omnino ignotum. Now I affirm that if either of these two points could be proved, so far would it be from rendering Wetstein's argument conclusive, that it would at once effectually destroy it.—Wetstein's argument stands thus:

In a manuscript brought by the Bishop of Clermont to the council of Trent was contained a certain reading:—this reading has *bitherto* been found in the Cambridge manuscript *alone*:—therefore *I conjecture* that the Cambridge manuscript was brought to the council of Trent.

As metamorphosed by the Doctor it will stand thus:

In a manuscript brought by the Bishop of Clermont to the council of Trent was contained a certain reading:—this Clermont copy alone at that time exhibited this reading:—

therefore the Cambridge manuscript, which contains this reading, was *necessarily* at the council of Trent.

Or again thus:

In a manuscript brought by the Bishop of Clermont to the council of Trent was contained a certain reading:—all the manuscripts, which

which were at that council, are in existence and known to us:—therefore the Cambridge manuscript, which alone contains this reading, was necessarily at the council of Trent.

We see then that Wetstein's argument supposes as *possible* a discovery which might subvert it:—that the Doctor's argument *excludes* such possibility. If then Wetstein's argument was *not* Wetstein's argument, our Promoter informs us that Wetstein's argument would be conclusive.

XVI. *Quarta Wetstenii de codice nostro conjectura est,* “ Unum esse eundemque ac librum illum MStum, quem Robertus Stephanus ita defribit in præfatione sua ad Nov. Test. A. 1550 græce editum,

It must immediately strike the reader as remarkable, that though our Promoter has attempted to state, however imperfectly, the grounds of the three former conjectures, yet this fourth unfortunate conjecture he has left to shift for itself by an *entire omission* of the basis on which it rests. AND WE ARTICLE AND OBJECT AS ABOVE. Indeed as the Doctor had he brought forward and endeavoured

voured to confute this basis, must have taken a very long journey from *home*, and as travelling is now become exceedingly chargeable, I must confess I cannot but admire his prudence. But if he is not able or willing to enter into a discussion of those subjects, which fall immediately within his province as an editor of Beza, the question is still unanswered, why did he write a preface at all? Surely an hypothesis, which is supported by the respectable names of Wetstein, Bengelius, Michaelis, Griesbach, and Porson, deserved a better confutation than a pompous repetition of the trite testimony of Beza. Yet even in walking over this beaten path our Promoter stumbles so frequently, that I begin to think him equally qualified to manage either internal or external evidence.

—But before we examine his observations it may not be improper to premise, that the only probable conclusion, which can be deduced from Beza's testimony, is, that the manuscript *was* discovered in a monastery at Lyons in 1562. But he never informs us that he discovered it there *himself*: for he uses in the three passages, where he mentions the place in which it was found, the ambiguous words *repertum*, *eruto*, and *nactus*. And indeed it seems very unlikely that he should have been in possession of it so early as 1562, and yet not

have availed himself of it in an edition of the New Testament till 1582. For his second edition was published in 1576. which would have allowed the ample space of fourteen years for the collation of his manuscript. The following assertion therefore of the Doctor appears destitute of probability:—*ibidemque permanxit octodecim plus annis, administer per id tempus consiliariusque Bezae, tertiam suam concinnanti Novi Fœderis editionem.*—Beza then might have received the manuscript at a distance from Lyons from some person, who brought it to him for sale; and if so, his information even as to the place where it was discovered, might not be authentic.—But let us suppose that he found it at Lyons himself in 1562. yet his evidence can reach no farther than that fact: for it is by no means certain that the monks of St. Irenæus could give him any clear history of this manuscript;—where it came from,—how long it had lain there. Nay it is evident from Beza's own language that as to the former point he speaks from conjecture; for he says,—*ex Græcia, ut apparet ex barbaris Græcis quibusdam ad marginem adscriptis, olim exportatum,*—and again,—*nisi ex Græcia fuisse ante aliquot secula importatum ex aliis indicis constaret.*—With respect to the latter point, if the manuscript had been brought

brought into the monastery at Lyons after it had been collated by Henry Stephens in Italy, it might still be so entirely covered with dust in 1562. as to carry the appearance of having lain there time immemorial.—Let us now see how our Promoter has handled the subject.

—cujus ipse amplectior sententiam*, cum
aliis

* Though the language of Dr. Kipling does not authorize us to conclude that he embraces Semler's opinion in any greater extent than as it *directly opposes* the conjecture of Wetstein, yet should he be inclined to take refuge in the hypothesis, which Semler has advanced in its stead, (though, as I before observed, he would be then guilty of an *omission*,) it may not be amiss to bestow a few words upon the subject.—The hypothesis of Semler may be very easily confuted. He supposes that the Codex ϵ was a Greek transcript from the Codex Bezae, made and brought into Italy a *short* time before it was collated by Henry Stephens. Michaelis (V. II. p. 238.) is perfectly accurate in this representation of the hypothesis, as will be evident from Semler's own words.—aberit casus omnis, si statuamus, quod non est a verosimilitudine alienum, apographum istius codicis Cantabrigiensis græcum jam *ante aliquod tempus* a quodam in Italiam olim adiectum fuisse. Ut ad Complutensia biblia jam non revertar, vel Erasmi græcae editiones et aliae hic ibi excusæ hominem non omnino eruditissimum facile poterant impellere, ut hic ibi requireret græcos codices in monasteriorum bibliothecis latentes. The meaning of *olim* is here restrained by *ante aliquod tempus*; and the next sentence shews that *ante aliquod tempus* was intended to reach no higher than the beginning of the sixteenth century; that is, *not half a century* before the transcript was collated: whereas Stephens calls his Codex ϵ *vetustissimum* exemplar.—Besides, Semler does not seem to have perceived, that it is not easy to reconcile this hypothesis with his own representation of Beza's testimony: for if the Codex Bezae was not discovered

aliis adductus rationibus, tum maxime propterea quod hæc Wetstenii conjectura Bezæ ipsius testimonio, manu scilicet sua scripto in principio nostri codicis MSti, omnino repugnat.

That this conjecture of Wetstein entirely contradicts the testimony of Beza I must beg leave to deny; and in this denial I am supported by the authority of Bengelius†: it only contradicts

till 1562. how could a copy of it have been taken only half a century before?—It will not, I hope, be deemed presumption, if I deliver it as my opinion, that the remarks of Semler on this head were written in haste and without due attention: to what other cause can we attribute the following question? Qui potuit fieri, ut Beza codicem eum diceret Lugdunensem, quem debebat Claromontanum appellare? He *twice* calls it Claromontanus. This principal difficulty Semler does not attempt to remove: for he says, Ceterum, si hoc verum sit, vix putem de bona fide Beza et Stephani satis constare, sed *subesse hic aliquid monstri*. Which is leaving us just as wise as he found us, and is in fact deserting his own cause.

† Hunc ipsum esse codicem auctor Proleg. existimat, quem Claromontensis episcopus, (ut ex Victorio Mariano docet Lucas Brugensis in not. ad Joh. 21. 22.) A. 1546. Tridentum attulit: eodem anno et deinceps Rob. Stephanus editiones dedid suas; quarum tertia A. 1550 codicem Steph. & celebrat, *per amicos in Italia collatum*. Quam facile sub eam collationem, sat longo temporum intervallo, Lugdunum vel mitti potuit vel remitti codex, et *in monasterio S. Irenæi in pulvere*, ut Beza ait, *jacere usque ad A. 1562?* NON SUNT HÆC EJUSMODI, QUÆ NON COHÆREANT; præsertim cum ipse Beza in ultima sua editione, A. 1598, Claromontanum hunc dicat codicem, qui hodie Cant. dicitur. Apparat. Crit. p. 82.

contradicts that part of it which asserts, that the manuscript had lain in the monastery *a long time* in the dust: but this assertion, for ought we can prove to the contrary, might be made only from conjecture.

“Est,” inquit Beza, “hoc exemplar venerandumæ vetustatis ex Græcia, ut appareat ex barbaris græcis quibusdam ad marginem adductis, olim exportatum, et in Sti Irenæi monasterio Lugduni, ita ut hic cernitur, multilatum, postquam ibi in pulvere diu jacu-

I am too well acquainted with the inaccuracy of Beza to be very anxious to reconcile the contradiction in his testimony; nor am I at all obliged to attempt it: for if I only shew, as I soon shall, that the solution of this contradiction, which is proposed by Michaelis and our Promoter, is by no means satisfactory and is subverted by historical evidence, this little excursion of the Doctor from home will be rendered abortive.—Beza vero testimonium (says Wetstein,) hac in causa non esse omni exceptione majus, cum sibi ipse contradixerit. Unde sequitur, nisi quis Bezam prius cum Beza conciliaverit, nihil plus valitum ejus testimonium *contra* me quam pro me.—I cannot however forbear noticing that in the above arrangement of Bengelius there is nothing forced and improbable. The manuscript might have been brought by the Bishop of Clermont to the council of Trent, and from that circumstance be properly denominated Codex Claromontanus:—afterwards (See Marsh, p. 699. 700.) it might have been collated in Italy by Henry Stephens:—and thence (as Michaelis says, V. II. p. 239.) “brought by some accident to Lyons, and discovered there in 1562, by some one, who was ignorant of its value, and was able to give no further account of it.” Beza would thus have been only mistaken or misinformed as to the *length of time* it had lain at Lyons.

“isset

“is et, repertum, oriente ibi civili bello, anno
“Domini 1562.” Ex quibus colligi licet, a
concilio supra dicto Tridenti habitu, vix SEX-
DECIM intercessisse annos, cum Theodorus
Beza codicem suum, pulvere obrutum, in lu-
cem demum protulerit.

I must again deny that this conclusion can be deduced from Beza's testimony: not a syllable can I see in it concerning Theodore Beza. But because it informs us that the manuscript was discovered in 1562, the Doctor by the assistance of his new Logic immediately finds out that it *must* have been then brought to light by Beza himself:—because somebody discovered it, *Theodore Beza* discovered it.—I will however beg leave to acquaint our Promoter, as Bentley did Boyle, that “if his new system of Logic teaches him such arguments, I will be content with the old ones.”

Quoniam vero jure dicere potuerit de libro, qui tam paucos ante annos ad concilium adfuerat Tridentinum, et in Italia quoque perlectum fuerat, “DIU illum *Lugduni* in pulvere jacuisse?”

He might either have been misinformed or mistaken.—But I must request the reader to attend to our Promoter's FALSE CONCORD, qui—perleatum fuerat, upon which I shall make no comments, but shall leave it, as he did Mr.

Frend's

Frend's *spiritual incantation*, to the judgment of the court.

Fac igitur codicem nostrum, ut vult Wetstenius, *sexdecim* nondum Lugduni commoratum fuisse *annos*, itane scripsisset Beza, “Exemplar “ hoc ex Græcia fuit ante aliquot *sæcula* im-“ portatum?”

Ut vult Wetstenius! ha! ha! ha! The Doctor is exceedingly facetious. Quam vellem, in cubiculo tuo essem, ut demulcerem tibi caput, ita vir comis et lepidus es. (Bentl. Emedat, in Menandr. p. 126.) Why, Sir, Wetstein did not suppose that the manuscript had been at Lyons *at all*: as your own quotation from him in the very next paragraph might have taught you. Aut vero omnia me fallunt, aut Beza permutavit ac confudit nomina suorum codicum, vocando Lugdunensem, qui Claramontanus erat, et vicissim.—But let us put out of the question, ut vult Wetstenius; and I then answer, as above, that Beza might have been misinformed or mistaken as to the *length of time* the manuscript had lain at Lyons.

But the Doctor goes on to ask, Num sic porro dixisset, “Ex quibusdam constat indiciis “ codicem hunc ex Græcia olim fuisse importa-“ tum,” si modo in Italia perpaucos ante annos perfectus fuisse, simul et cum aliis quibusdam collatus exemplaribus? We have seen above that

that Beza speaks from his *own conjecture* as to the place whence his manuscript came; and accordingly Wetstein properly expresses himself in the following passages: Scriptum fuisse neque in Græcia neque a Græco (ut Beza *putarat*) sed in Occidente &c. Denique in margine occurrit manus, ut Beza *putavit*, Calo-geri Græci, ut nos vero existimamus Monachi Latini,—Not to mention that its original importation from Greece would have been by no means inconsistent with any subsequent migrations from France to Italy and from Italy to France.

Again: Anne omnino credibile est, omis-
rum Bezam ex monachis sciscitari, tantæ vetus-
tatis ~~temporis~~, sibi in manus tradentibus, Unde?
Cujus olim? Quo casu? et cætera ejusmodi?
As, according to Dr. Bentley's supposition,
Mr. Boyle would have nothing less than the
Mayor, and Aldermen, and Recorder, to be
named, for a proof that Taurominium was a
city;—so our Promoter seems to think it im-
possible for Beza to have procured his manu-
script from the monastery, unless the Prior
and Monks attended in due form, and present-
ed the book to Beza with the same solemnity
as the Promoter himself did his own fac-simile
to the best of Sovereignr.—But even if Beza
found the manuscript at Lyons himself, might
he

he not possibly have been guilty of a literary theft?

Nemone autem præsto tunc adfuit monachus, qui ei narraret, (si ita quidem res fuerit) codicem MStum nostrum adeo non Lugduni mansisse ab Irenæi pene temporibus ad illum usque diem, ut nuperrime migrasset ab Italia?

I shall reply to this question in the words of Mr. Marsh* :—“ when we consider that monks ‘in general are less attached to learning, ‘than to luxury, and that Greek manuscripts ‘are commodities, in which the monks of St. ‘Irenæus never dealt, it is by no means im- ‘possible that they were ignorant, not only of ‘the time when it was brought, but even that ‘such a manuscript existed among them.” I have made this reply upon the supposition that Beza, or some one else, received the manuscript from the monks. But if it was stolen, as no questions could have been asked, so no answers could have been given upon the subject.—Hitherto then we may safely pronounce, that if our Promoter’s declamation possesses any merit, it is that of eloquence rather than of argument.

Hisce tandem talibusque impeditus difficultibus, nec semetipsum potuisse falli opinans
Wetstenius, P. 699. et 713. et 714.
videlicet
H

Wetstenius,

Wetsteinus, Bezam videlicet nescio cuius sive
incuriae sive doli insimulat.

That Wetstein concerned himself with, or was embarrassed by such difficulties as these, one only excepted, is a position highly improbable and destitute of foundation. The simple difficulty with Wetstein was,—If it be true that the MS. had lain at Lyons in the dust till 1562, whence could Stephens have derived the readings of the same MS. in 1550? But to wave this point, the Doctor is inaccurate in considering this difficulty as a *ground*, upon which Wetstein charged Beza with confusion in the names of his MSS. whereas it is only introduced as a *motive for embracing* the ground, which are stated by Wetstein. The *first* ground, which the Doctor has entirely omitted, is,—that by this means would be excellently illustrated what Wetstein had above produced from Marianus Victorius:—*si ENIM statuamus Evangeliorum Codicem fuisse Claramontanum; eglie illustratur, quod supra ex Victoriq attulimus.*—The *second* ground is,—that Beza himself in the body of his annotations no where calls his MS. *Lugdunensem*, but twice in his last edition expressly *Claramontanum.*

Where Wetstein, as our Promoter asserts, imagines himself to be infallible, I cannot possibly

sibly find ;—a trait, which is more justly applicable to the Doctor himself.—From *internal evidence* Wetstein had discovered* with great probability that the Codex c and the Codex Bezae are one and the same MS. This internal evidence he states to the reader. But so far is he from esteeming himself *infallible* with respect to this discovery, that he speaks of it only as a *very probable conjecture*. Nec ego dixi (says he,) id *necessario sequi*, sed *conjectura admodum verosimili*, ad quam firmandam attuli, nisi fallor, quidquid afferri poterat; adeo ut injustum foret majorem a me exigere evidentiam, quam rei ipsius fert natura. Yet our Promoter carefully keeping out of sight the *internal evidence* and consequently the grounds, upon which Wetstein had formed his conjecture, holds him up to view as an obstinate bigot.

We find the Doctor in his quotation from Wetstein driving on his old trade of *omission* :—
Cæterum codex ille noster Claromontanus totum hunc locum legit. We read in Wetstein and Beza,—totum hunc locum SIC legit.

* “ This discovery is of real importance; for, since the Cod. Cant. varies from the common Greek text in a greater degree than any other, it makes a material difference, whether the deviations are peculiar to this manuscript, or whether they are confirmed by other authority.” Michaelis, V. II. p. 237.

Our Promoter in the next paragraph has faithfully copied the inaccuracies of Michaelis. In a work of magnitude and various matter such inaccuracies may be easily pardoned : but what apology can be offered for them in a preface of only twenty eight pages I am at a loss to surmise.

Quoniam vero, vel ipso fatente Michaele, quem sententiæ suæ participem habet Wetsteinus, hæc utraque scripsit et ætate proiectior, et non manu tantummodo, sed memoria etiam vacillans ;—

That Beza's memory was impaired when he wrote these two notes, is an assertion not only unsupported but contradicted by historical testimony. Thuanus, speaking of his death, relates :*—siquidem præsentium memoriam, debilitata quippe mente, evanidam amiserat, præteritorum, dum ingenio valebat, impressam servaverat. Itaque et totos psalmos Hebraice, et quodcumque caput ex B. Pauli epistolis proposuisses, integrum Græce recitabat, nec in iis, quæ olim didicerat, judicio carebat, sed quæ dixerat, statim obliscebatur. In hoc mentis oblivioso languore fere BIENNIUM perseveravit ;—From this passage it is manifest

* Hist. Lib. 134. V. IV. p. 1181. 1182. Ed. 1630.—Sully informs us that Beza preserved, till the last moment, the full force and vigour of his mind,—Memoirs, V. IV. p. 85. 8vo.

that the failure of memory, of which our Promoter makes mention, did not commence till two years before Beza's death; and consequently not till five years at least after he had written the above notes.—But even if we had been destitute of this historical evidence, the preface of Beza, dated the 1st of August, 1598. prefixed to his last edition of the New Testament, would have convinced us that he was at that time sufficiently capable of recollecting the names of his two MSS. In this preface, speaking of himself, he says:—adhuc satis recte et mente et corpore, octuagesimum annum ingressus, valeo:—a declaration, which we have no reason to call in question.—I hope therefore that we shall hear no more of Beza's failure of memory in 1598.

quoniam porro exemplar, de quo nunc agitur, quatuordecim ante annos ad Academiam misserat Cantabrigensem, quid mirum, si in hac ultima annotationum editione librum suum MStum semel atque iterum, non Lugdunensem, sed Claromontanum, forte appellaverit?

quatuordecim ante annos is a mistake: for as Beza's last edition was not published till 1598, he had sent away his MS. nearly *seventeen* years before that period.—But, I must confess, I cannot comprehend how the time of sending away

away the MS. can give any strength to the argument. For while Beza was preparing this edition, in which he professes to have employed peculiar diligence and exactness, the MS. must have been very frequently presented to his thoughts; and could we suppose him to have been doubtful of its proper appellation and to have retained but confused and slender traces of his threefold testimony, yet his evidence given in the page preceding the preface to his edition of 1582. would be always at hand to refresh his memory.—The Doctor's *semel atque iterum—forte appellaverit* might have some force, had Beza styled his MS. *Lugdunensem* an hundred times; but since he *thrice only* speaks of it as found at Lyons, is truly ridiculous. I must likewise observe, that as the appellation of *Claromontanus* is posterior to the other description, it might, if there was any necessity, be fairly considered as a tacit correction of a former error*.

But if our Promoter has hitherto been less successful than he might have wished, in the following sentence he is determined to come upon us with a clincher:—*si—revera exemplar illud Claro-monte reperiisset;*—If this had really been the case, no rational account could

* Compare Michaelis's Note (n) V. II. p. 239.

have been possibly given of Beza's conduct. But where, I pray, does Wetstein suppose, or Beza inform us, that *Beza himself* found the MS. at Clermont? He simply calls it *Codex Claromontanus*.

In the next paragraph the Doctor remarks, *Neque illud quidem leve est, Bezam prorsus idem, non semel tantummodo, sed ter reddisse testimonium,—That the testimony is entirely the same I must venture to deny: for in his letter to the University senate he only mentions the place from which he procured the MS. but does not say a syllable concerning the length of time it had lain there.* This threefold testimony therefore can only be brought to establish the former point; and this paragraph of the Promoter, if he knows any thing of the *lucidus ordo*, ought to be confined to this point.—Yet here the Doctor plays off upon us a little of his wagery; and deduces the following illegitimate conclusion from the threefold testimony: *Verisimillimum est itaque exemplar hoc suum, haud Claramonte, sed Lugduni, fuisse repertum, "postquam ibi diu jacuisset in pulvere,"—Softly, Sir; we cannot admit the insertion of "postquam ibi diu jacuisset in pulvere;" though we plainly perceive that it is essentially necessary to support your latter conclusion, atque adeo nec ad concilium.*

concilium adfuisse Tridentinum, nec unum idemque esse ac R. Stephani e. But the Doctor's former conclusion (omitting the clause, "postquam ibi diu jacuisset in pulvere,") is by no means founded upon invulnerable reasoning:—statiuamus necesse est, aut Beza ter esse *consilio mentitum*, aut librum hunc suum in Irenæi, non in Claromontano, olim delituisse coenobio. —What! might not Beza have been thrice *mistaken*? As our Promoter is infallible himself, he makes no allowance for the infirmities of others:—involuntary errors are by him magnified into deliberate falsehoods: We well remember the "*sciens volensque mentitur*" applied to Dr. Priestley.

Claromontano *coenobio*! By what fatality of blundering is our Promoter actuated? Who ever imagined that the MS. lay concealed in the *convent* of Clermont? Wetstein expressly cautions us against this misconception:—dummodo Clarum montem NON obscurum apud Bellovacos *coenobium*, ut Beza putavit, sed antiquissimam *Episcopi sedeni* apud Arvernates intelligamus.

We now therefore article and object to our Promoter, that he has not given a just representation of *any one* of Wetstein's four conjectures. AND WE ARTICLE AND OBJECT AS ABOVE.

T A N T U M.



